

Vallance P. [The historical roots and development of the civic university](#). In: Goddard, J; Hazelkorn, E; Kempton, L. Vallance, P, ed. *The Civic University: The Leadership and Policy Challenges*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2016, pp.16-33.

Copyright:

This is a draft chapter. The final version is available in The Civic University: The Leadership and Policy Challenges edited by Goddard, J; Hazelkorn, E; Kempton, L. Vallance, P., published in 2016 by Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher, and is for private use only.

DOI link to book:

<http://www.e-elgar.com/shop/the-civic-university>

Date deposited:

21/12/2016

Embargo release date:

25 May 2017

The historical roots and development of the civic university

Paul Vallance

Chapter 2 in Goddard, J., Hazelkorn, E., Kempton, L. and Vallance, P. (eds.), 2016, *The Civic University: The Policy and Leadership Challenges*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK. pp. 16-33.

Introduction

The basic premise of this chapter is that the present-day form of the civic university with which this volume is concerned can only be understood in relation to the historical development of this particular model of a higher education institution. For many readers the precise use of the term 'civic university' will refer to a small number of institutions in large English cities that have grown from nineteenth-century local university colleges with strong links to industry into current research-intensive universities. Beyond this specific context, however, many universities throughout Europe (including those pre- and post-dating the nineteenth century) can be said to be civic in the more general sense of having been founded as municipal institutions with strong roots in the culture of the cities in which they are located (Bender, 1988). In addition, a rich civic tradition has marked higher education in the United States (US) from the nineteenth century, exemplified by (but not limited to) the land-grant universities. The latter-day revival of this American tradition, and the subsequent influence this has had on modern concepts of civic universities and engagement more widely, means that it will be discussed in this chapter alongside the historical developments in Europe that are more directly antecedent of the institutions that supply the case studies in this book.

Despite the parallels that can be drawn with the emergence of civic universities in Europe, the corresponding American tradition has a number of distinctive features that provide a useful counterpoint in the following review. In particular, the notion of higher education having an essentially democratic purpose in the development of citizenship, and this rather than more practical engagement with local industries being the core of its civic mission, has been much stronger in the development of higher education in the US since its independence as a nation-state in the late eighteenth century (Scott, 2006). This contrast reflects two possible meanings of ‘civic’ in this context. As Barnett (2007, pp. 28–29) writes: ‘the idea of “civic” relates both to a “city” and to a “citizen” ... The civic university, therefore, suggests a dual orientation of service: towards individuals as responsible persons, and towards the political region (the city and/or the state)’.

While these two meanings may in many ways be complementary and mutually reinforcing, they do have different implications for the expectations of the role of universities in society as shaped by different historical narratives and cultural beliefs. These implications will be explored across the following three sections that respectively cover the emergence (nineteenth century and before), decline (twentieth century), and rediscovery (late twentieth and early twenty-first century) of civic universities in the United Kingdom (UK), rest of Europe, and the US. The chapter then concludes with a brief discussion of two other contemporary developments in higher education – marketisation and globalisation – that represent challenges to the revival of the civic university.

Origins of the Civic University

The earliest European universities date back to the thirteenth century, but the formation of new universities remained sporadic and geographically uneven throughout most of the next 600 years (Frijhoff, 1996). The foundation of new universities during this period was related less closely to economic or demographic patterns than to the exercise of local political authority by the church or state, and therefore occurred most often in territories such as Italy

or Germany characterised by high levels of regional political decentralisation and provincial claims to autonomy (Riddle, 1993). Universities at this time were predominately teaching institutions that concentrated on training students for professions in the three main subject areas of theology, law and medicine. Unlike the monasteries in which higher learning had previously been based, the new universities (whether located in larger or smaller cities) were placed within an urban environment that generated sometimes antagonistic relationships between local and student populations (Brockliss, 2000). The parallel development of modern science in post-Renaissance Europe was also an urban phenomenon, but largely took place outside of universities until it first became institutionalised as part of academic practice in Germany during the nineteenth century (Taylor et al., 2008). This new prioritisation of the research function alongside teaching, combined with the introduction of the principle of academic freedom and the granting of equal status to subjects in the arts and sciences, was the basis of the influential Humboldtian model of the university (Scott, 2006). The emergence of this model however was also strongly connected to the formation of the modern German nation-state; and with funding and direct control from this state, the new universities were invested with wider societal roles related to the training of civil servants and other elite professions, and to the cultivation and transmission of a national culture and identity (Delanty, 2002; Scott, 2006; Martin, 2012).

In England, Oxford and Cambridge were the only two universities until well into the nineteenth century, reflecting the centralisation of political power in a territorial entity without strong provinces (Riddle, 1993). This can also be contrasted with the four 'ancient universities' in operation in Scotland from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and (when Ireland was a kingdom under the sovereignty of an English monarch) the foundation of Trinity College Dublin in 1592 (see Chapter 8 in this volume). Moves to fill the most glaring gap on the English university map began with the foundation in 1826 of an institution that soon became known as University College London; the initial constituent (with King's College) of a federal University of London (see Chapter 13 in this volume). The location of

these university colleges in the capital city meant that, as well as forming a metropolitan alternative to Oxford and Cambridge, 'London University rapidly acquired a national mission and almost concurrently an imperial one' (Rothblatt, 1988, p. 137). This mission was reinforced with the state-driven expansion of the University of London into the early twentieth century, particularly with the integration of the Royal College of Science into the new Imperial College London in 1907 to give Britain an institution that could emulate the technological research and education carried out in German universities (Vernon, 2001).

Outside of London, Durham University had been founded in 1832, but a wider expansion began in the mid-nineteenth century with the foundation of university colleges in the growing industrial cities of the North and Midlands such as Birmingham, Manchester and Newcastle that would later (mostly early in the next century) receive charters to gain university status (Barnes, 1996; Vernon, 2001; Walsh, 2009). These civic institutions were established with the support of the local business class, and as Sanderson (1988, p. 91) argues, '[t]he circumstances of their founding, the thrust of their studies and research, the background and career of their students, their whole ethos was rooted in the industrial culture from which they derived their purpose and which they served'. Accordingly, they typically included departments in engineering and science-based subjects (as well as medicine) that provided for the educational requirements of the local students who would enter a career in industry, as well as allowing professors to undertake research-informed consultancy with closely related firms (Sanderson, 1972, 1988). Hence, these university colleges helped to meet the need for vocational education and applied research that elsewhere in Europe had been addressed by the development of technical institutes (separate from universities) throughout Germany, and later on in the early 1900s, by the establishment of engineering institutes throughout France (Locke, 1984; Sanderson, 1988). In England however, notwithstanding their civic roots, the transition of these colleges into full universities was only achieved with additional grant financing from the state, which was conditioned on these institutions not just specialising in narrowly technical or vocational subjects, but also acting as regional centres of the advanced arts and science education that

was seen in England as the distinguishing feature of universities along the lines of Oxford and Cambridge (Vernon, 2001).

A separate civic university tradition developed during roughly the same period in the US (Delanty, 2002). The closest equivalent to the parallel European form this took is represented by the establishment, following the Morrill Act of 1862, of colleges across the country funded through land granted to the states by the federal government. Like the civic universities in England and other parts of Europe, the foundation of these land-grant institutions both expanded higher education access to a larger share of the population, and fulfilled a wider societal function related to the needs of a developing economy (Key, 1996). However, in contrast to the European civic tradition, the practical orientation decreed by this economic mission was focused particularly on the development of agriculture through applied science and 'extension programmes' for rural community engagement and knowledge transfer (McDowell, 2003). Accordingly, the land-grant colleges founded out of the 1862 Act, which have mostly grown into leading public universities, were typically located outside the main urban centres of the time and in what have now become 'college towns' with a distinctive cultural and economic legacy shaped by the presence of their dominant higher education institutions (Gumprecht, 2003; Mack and Stolarick, 2014).

The network of land-grant universities have in some ways come to embody the civic engagement ideal in American higher education (see below), but despite their undoubted historical and contemporary significance it is possible that the uniqueness of the circumstances in which they were established have been overstated. In post-revolution America even before the first Morrill Act, many colleges of different types were formed throughout the newly independent country (including those with federal support through land-grants), and with the decision not to pursue a proposed national university, these institutions were established and primarily supported by individual states (Johnson, 1981; Cohen, 1998; Scott, 2006). As Scott (2006) outlines, the support for local agriculture and industries through technical education associated particularly with the land-grant universities became part of the mission of these colleges, but a more general civic purpose for higher

education already existed in this context of nineteenth-century America in the form of 'democratization, or service to the individual of the nation-state' (p. 15). This mission, with the aim of developing students to be well-rounded citizens and leaders for the new democratic society, could be fulfilled through the predominately liberal arts based education of the early European-influenced American colleges. Indeed, to the present day 'undergraduate civic or democratic education ... remains a traditional strand inside of the teaching mission' of US universities (Scott, 2006, p. 16; also see Hurtado, 2007). The land-grant movement, as well as bringing this liberal arts curriculum together with technical and vocational education in the same institutions (Trow, 2006), helped to extend the democratic remit by widening social access to higher education, and paired it with the more practical direct engagement with local non-university communities (Boyer, 1990; Scott, 2006). This paved the way for American universities to assume a more formalised 'public service' orientation as they moved into the twentieth century, encompassing a range of external engagement activities (for example, applied research, consulting, service learning) with partners at variously local, state and national scales (Scott, 2006). The weaving of these different traditions in the revival of the distinctive civic quality in American higher education will be returned to below.

Decline of the Civic University

The integration of universities into more regulated national higher education systems during the twentieth century is generally understood as resulting in a diminishment of their early civic missions, as research and teaching goals defined primarily at the national level came to be prioritised. This process is well documented in the case of the English civic universities founded in industrial centres during the nineteenth century. For instance, Barnes (1996) argues that these institutions began to lose their initial distinctive identity as early as the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in relation to five intersecting developments. First, the role of universities in society became more oriented towards the education of the growing

professional class. Second, the 'professionalisation of the academic career itself' privileged fundamental research in evermore specialised fields and an 'emphasis on theory over practice and disinterested inquiry over industrially driven research' (p. 293). Third, increasing state funding for universities culminated in the formation of the University Grants Committee in 1919, which reduced reliance on local sources of income and 'served to promote a single definition of the university' (p. 298). Fourth, this single model of the university was based on the 'Oxbridge ideal' and the effect of 'an anti-industrialist, anti-urban, anti-technological bias' in the dominant culture of the English elite (p. 302). Fifth, a more general loss of civic pride in the cities of the North and Midlands stemmed from the twentieth-century decline in the economic and cultural status of the English provinces as national public life became centred on London. In this analysis, the civic universities 'did not abandon their mission in the twentieth century, [but] students, employers, government officials, and outside observers, along with faculty and administrators at the civics themselves, all came to value it differently' (Barnes, 1996, p. 303). Indeed, Vernon (2009) shows that the civic universities continued to engage extensively with the local public, employers, hospitals and local authorities into the inter-war years of the twentieth century, although the growing emphasis on creating a 'discrete student experience' through investing in halls of residence and other facilities arguably helped to weaken the connection between the universities and its surrounding community. Other historians have dated the key changes that undermined the original mission of the civic universities to later in the century. For instance, in relation to the process of 'professionalisation' emphasised by Barnes (1996) and others, Schwarz (2004) argues that employment of higher education graduates only became the norm for occupations such as solicitors and accountants in the post-war 1950s, when a larger proportion of the middle class began to attend university. The coincidence of this period of rapid expansion in numbers of higher education students with the marginalisation of a civic mission for universities is reflected in the nature of the new institutions established to help meet this growing demand for student places: as Heyck (1987, p. 215) observes, the so-called 'plateglass universities' created during the 1960s were designed to recruit nationally rather

than locally, were generally located in smaller cities rather than industrial centres, and also followed the Oxbridge model in respect of being residential universities and adopting a tutorial-based mode of learning.

This expansion of national higher education systems was a worldwide trend during the second half of the twentieth century (Schofer and Meyer, 2005), and was often accompanied by a process of diversification in which new types of higher education institution were created to meet different forms of demand within the system and fulfil different societal functions (Altbach, 1999; Hazelkorn, 2012). In particular, within many countries in Europe and further afield there were structural reforms during the second half of the twentieth century to establish a new sector of non-university teaching institutions that could specialise in the provision of vocational higher education (for example, polytechnics, technical colleges, and so on), although the exact nature and extent of this diversification varied from system to system (Teichler, 1988). These functions oriented to serving local employers are one of the forms that a civic mission in higher education had taken in the past (see above), and their transfer to other types of institutions left older 'elite' universities to focus on more prestigious academic research activities in an increasingly stratified institutional hierarchy (Calhoun, 2006). In countries that entered the second half of the twentieth century with relatively undeveloped higher education systems, however, this period of expansion was also one in which new research and teaching universities with strong municipal or regional foundations were established. For instance, in Finland during the 1960s and 1970s the university sector expanded out of the south of country for the first time, including new institutions (sometimes absorbing existing colleges) in cities such as Tampere (see Chapter 6 in this volume), Oulu and Jyväskylä (Saarivirta, 2010). In addition, many of the technical institutions established with the expansion of the twentieth century have subsequently themselves become universities (for example, the former polytechnics in England and Wales following the abolition of the binary system in 1992) or assumed a

broader range of teaching and research functions that bring them closer to universities (as represented in this volume by Chapter 9 on Dublin Institute of Technology).

In many ways the US has been the international archetype for a diversified mass higher education system, due to the range of different public and private institutions (for example, liberal arts colleges, research universities, community colleges, historically black and women colleges) that it has supported throughout its history (Cohen, 1998; Trow, 2006). The continuing expansion and widening access of American higher education during the twentieth century can be seen to have deepened its democratic rationale, which was manifested in the radical student activism and political engagement of the 1960s and 1970s (Delanty, 2001, 2002). However, within this system, the significant influence of the German Humboldtian model on American universities from the late nineteenth century led to the focus in these leading institutions moving increasingly from the traditional teaching mission to research (Boyer, 1990; Martin, 2012). This shift was reinforced in the post-war period with a dramatic increase in basic research funding from the federal government, as scientific and technological progress came to be seen as crucial to national security and economic development (Bush, 1945). Despite the considerable economic, health and other benefits to society that this investment in fundamental research has reaped (see Rosenberg and Nelson, 1994; Stokes, 1997), the expanding research function of American universities has been associated by many with the civic disengagement of the academy. For instance, Harkavy and Puckett (1994) bemoan the fragmentation of these comprehensive institutions into separate departments producing increasingly specialised discipline-based knowledge that is of diminishing relevance to the outside world. This is related, as in the process observed in England (see above), to the professionalisation of the academic occupation and the development of a reward structure that favours research and publication over public engagement (Checkoway, 2001). As Boyer (1990) writes of this post-war period: 'Ironically, at the very time America's higher education institutions were becoming more open and inclusive, the culture of the professoriate was becoming more hierarchical and restrictive' (pp. 12–13). For teaching as well, however, the move to mass higher education, and the

opportunity for social mobility that this creates for a larger share of the population, means that student attitudes on the purpose of attending university have also changed, with increasing future earning power becoming the single biggest motivation (Astin, 1998). As Altbach (1999) summarises, students are now 'less interested in the intrinsic values of higher education' and 'see themselves as consumers of educational products' (p. 122). This perceived loss of a wider sense of citizenship amongst students is a particular focus of attention for the resurgence of the civic mission in the US (Hartley, 2009).

Rediscovery of the Civic University

The end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries have seen something of a revival of attention paid to the civic mission of universities on both sides of the Atlantic. This has been strongest in the US where, as Hartley (2009) recounts, a sense of loss of purpose and identity amongst civically minded members of the academy, arising from the disengagement of research universities and students caused by the structural changes described above, led to a counter-movement that aimed to reaffirm the democratic and public foundations of their higher education institutions (also see Ostrander, 2004). This movement soon became formalised through associations of colleges and universities such as Campus Compact (founded in 1986) that developed codified statements on civic engagement (for example, the 'Wingspread Declaration' of 1999). Another such network was the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which in 1996 set up a commission supported by the Kellogg Foundation to produce a series of reports on different aspects of their public mission (for example, student experience and access, community engagement, lifelong learning) under the heading 'Returning to our Roots' (Kellogg Commission, 2001). As this title suggests, the Kellogg Commission reports emphasised the rediscovery of these universities' traditional mission of engagement with their state and local communities (Hartley, 2009). A more practical guide to implementing this mission, produced as a follow-up to the Kellogg Commission, advanced a model of

public engagement that involves place-related interaction for mutual benefit with community and regional partners, and for this to be adopted in an integrated way across all parts and functions of the institution (AASCU Task Force on Public Engagement, 2002).

Generally, however, this US civic engagement movement is perhaps more likely to appeal to the universal democratic and moral values conveyed by the founding belief that a sense of citizenship should be integral to higher education in America (discussed above). As represented by Boyer's (1990, 1996) influential formulation of 'the scholarship of engagement', this sense of public service to the nation extends to the varied research and teaching activities of university faculty. However, recalling the liberal undergraduate education roots of the early US colleges, the modern civic engagement movement has focused above all on the activities and values of students (Sax, 2000). The paradigmatic form that this movement has therefore taken has been service learning, which embeds community and civic engagement into the formal curriculum (see Bringle and Hatcher, 1996; Zlotkowski, 2007). This focus may have been successful in terms of helping to integrate service learning as a more mainstream element of undergraduate programmes, but some argue that this institutionalisation has been at the cost of the underlying notion of civic engagement becoming overly oriented towards apolitical, narrowly instrumentalist pedagogic ends and away from the more transformative social and democratic goals foreseen by its early advocates (Hartley, 2009). Hartley et al. (2010) point to the limits of civic engagement defined by 'activity and place', in which new courses or programmes are created for community-based work, but are 'often adaptive to the existing culture of higher education and rarely call for changes in the way colleges and universities operate or challenge their underlying assumptions or behaviours' (p. 397).

Notwithstanding this promotion of a 'larger purpose' for higher education (Boyer, 1996), the spatial setting in which this civic engagement takes place has still been a highly salient issue for American universities. While many colleges founded in the nineteenth century (including the land-grant institutions discussed above) were based in rural locations,

the trend over the course of the twentieth century was for universities increasingly to be located in urban environments as cities across the country grew rapidly (O'Mara, 2012). This location created opportunities for productive engagement by university members with residents of cities, as can be seen in the development of urban sociology as an applied field of study in Chicago during the early 1900s (influenced by the earlier activities of the social settlement Hull House) (Shils, 1988; Harkavy and Puckett, 1994; Menand, 2001). Indeed, work outlining the contemporary vision of the American civic university regularly evokes John Dewey and Jane Addams, key turn-of-the-century progressive social and educational reformers in Chicago, as representing the ideal to be followed (e.g., Benson and Harkavy, 2000; Checkoway, 2001; Hartley et al., 2010). The later 'urban crisis' of the 1950s and 1960s, however, coinciding as it did with the expansion of research universities, presented a more pragmatic issue for institutions with campuses adjacent to inner-city neighbourhoods undergoing economic and social decline, and prompted them to adopt a new corporate engagement function related to urban renewal (O'Mara, 2012). This role, in which institutional real estate and community engagement practices converge in an often uneasy alliance, continues to the present day as a feature of urban universities internationally (see Perry and Wiewel, 2005; Rodin, 2005; Bromley, 2006; Wiewel and Perry, 2008; Goddard and Vallance, 2013). The challenges for university leadership that this physical relationship creates can particularly be seen in contributions to this volume on Trinity College Dublin (Chapter 8) and UCL (Chapter 13).

This growing interest in the civic role of universities has also spread to other parts of the world. For instance, in a UK policy provocation, Goddard (2009) argues for the 're-invention of the civic university', in which engagement is 'an institution-wide commitment ... [that] has to embrace teaching as well as research, students as well as academics, and the full range of support services' (p. 4). This vision draws heavily on the contemporary revival of the US land-grant engagement principle, as well as referring back to the founding mission of the nineteenth-century English civic universities. However, despite the clear parallels between these traditions, the wider historical and social circumstances in which higher

education has developed in these different territories means that the civic mission of universities today assumes different forms and roles in the UK and rest of Europe than it does in the US. Through vehicles such as the Talloires Network (established in 2005 with the Talloires Declaration on the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education) (see Hollister et al., 2012), the concept of the engaged university has been advanced as a 'common vision that transcends context' on an even larger global (North and South) scale (Watson et al., 2011, p. 207). Equally, however, as Bawa and Munck (2012) note, 'we need to be aware of ... the danger of taking one particular national model as the norm for CE [civic engagement]. Whether it be the US "service" model or some other one, we need to accept that "one size fits all" is not a viable philosophy for CE' (p. xvii). For instance, while the connect between universities and the moral development and democratic participation dimensions of civic engagement does have some notable historical precedents in the UK, the belief that higher education should have a purpose of promoting citizenship is typically less embedded or explicit than it is in America with its unique liberal arts tradition (Annette, 2010). The movement towards more integrated higher education systems within the European Union (EU) has allowed social and cultural concerns about the development of students as European citizens, alongside their development as workers for the knowledge economy, to become part of the contemporary policy discourse (Biesta and Simons, 2009). However, Biesta et al. (2009) argue that the framing of this sense of citizenship in terms of the formation of individual competencies means that it still forms part of the wider EU 'innovation agenda' rather than helping to contribute to the democratic role of universities as institutions that can encourage critical thought and public dialogue.

The weaker historical connotation with the development of students as citizens means that civic engagement arguably has a more general meaning within Europe. In particular, where the growing role of universities in economic development has not generally been reflected in calls for a renewed civic mission in American higher education, that are couched in terms of its democratic purpose and contribution to social elements of the public good, in Europe interaction with industry is more likely to be seen of a piece with interaction

with communities as part of the broader category of third-stream engagement activities. For instance, Bond and Paterson (2005, p. 338), define civic engagement (for the purpose of a survey of UK academics) as ‘those activities which individual academics undertake which in some way involve interaction or engagement with the non-academic community and are related to academic expertise ... [E]conomic engagement is probably best thought of as a subset of, or at least overlapping with, civic engagement: the two are not rigidly distinct’. This means, for instance, that the concept of the entrepreneurial university, critically associated by many with a more business-oriented outlook on the part of institutions and faculty (e.g., Slaughter and Leslie, 1997), can be advanced in the context of changes in the English higher education environment as a framework for engagement with community and civil society ‘stakeholders’ more widely (Gibb and Haskins, 2014). The economic role within civic engagement does potentially have a strong local development dimension, in which universities are seen to be required to be responsive to the specific needs for knowledge and skills of their regions (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000). This could be interpreted as echoing the origins of many civic universities founded principally to support local industries, but the modern alignment of higher education with the economy is driven as much by growing expectations from national governments and other (for example, European) agencies for the research and teaching they fund to have some form of demonstrable value (or ‘impact’), as well as by the possibilities of financial returns for the universities themselves when research is successfully commercialised. The policy-driven nature of this transformation in higher education now also frames other more social forms of community and civic engagement, particularly in the European Union (Ward and Hazelkorn, 2012). This issue will be further explored over the next three chapters.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored different notions of the civic university in Europe and America, through stages of origin as municipal or state institutions in the nineteenth century and

before, decline with absorption into national higher education systems during the twentieth century, and rediscovery with increasing attention again being paid to the social roles and responsibilities of universities in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. It has highlighted contextual differences in the civic culture of universities relating to the legacies of founding missions informed by varying combinations of a local industrial spirit and national democratic spirit. In numerous ways, as the rest of this volume illustrates, civic engagement remains an ingrained part of the activities of universities to the current day. However, these inherited civic missions now co-exist alongside other potentially contradictory societal projects that universities have acquired over the course of their history (Delanty, 2002). As Robins and Webster (2002, p. 14) write, the historical development of universities 'should not be seen in terms of a straightforward succession of stages ... elements of earlier formations continue to persist, and to be fought over'. Therefore, to conclude the chapter, this final section will outline two other major recent developments in higher education systems that represent sources of tension for the revival of the civic mission of universities. These two dynamics are in several respects interrelated, but can be seen as corresponding respectively to the dual meanings of 'civic' in reference to universities (citizen and city) that have featured as themes in the preceding discussion.

The first countervailing trend is the growing influence of marketisation in higher education (Neary, 2014). Neoliberalism presents myriad threats to the public good role of universities, but it is the shifting of the financial burden from the state and onto individual 'consumers' (in part a corollary of the transition to mass systems discussed above) that has reinforced the long-term trend for students to be more likely to view economic self-interest as their main reason for taking a degree, and therefore further undermined the democratic mission of higher education in promoting values of social citizenship (Lynch, 2006). Giroux (2002) argues that the pervasive effect of market forces in US higher education means that 'civic discourse has given way to the language of commercialisation, privatization, and deregulation' (p. 426), leaving it necessary to reassert the critical function of universities in

society as a 'democratic public sphere'. For Delanty (2001) the new demands of promoting what he calls 'technological citizenship', necessary due to the centrality of knowledge and information technology in the contemporary world, has the potential to make the democratic role of universities as relevant as in earlier periods where it promoted cultural and social modes of citizenship. However, he cautions that universities are not currently fulfilling this potential to link technology and citizenship, because the discourse and practice of knowledge production in engagement with the outside world is predominately being shaped by the market rather than civil society.

The second countervailing trend, closely related to growing market-based competition as a force shaping contemporary higher education, is globalisation. This takes a number of forms, including growing emphasis placed on world rankings of universities, the opening of international branch campuses by many institutions, and the increasingly global mobility of students, staff and knowledge (see Jöns and Hoyler, 2013). For Robins and Webster (2002) these developments, along with those enabled by new information communication technologies, have contributed to the emergence of a new 'virtual-global' model of the university, which challenges the continuing position of the 'liberal-national' model that was dominant in the twentieth century. In geographical terms, universities clearly remain situated in manifold ways within the physical and social context of a specific place, but at the same time the international corporate strategies pursued by leading institutions form new non-territorially embedded network connections that are reconfiguring their spatial relations with society towards 'more complex, multifaceted and multiscalar' arrangements (Addie et al., 2015, p. 43). This globalisation, and particularly the accompanying pressure for universities to position themselves as 'world-class', unavoidably carries some risk of diverting institutional priorities away from activities focused on more local civic and community engagement (Watson, 2007; Scott, 2014). However, this issue should not be seen in terms of a simple binary trade-off between the global and local. Instead, it seems important to consider how the contemporary global reach of universities, and perhaps more than anything their greater than ever cosmopolitanism from the international mix of their

student and staff constituencies, is shaping the social, cultural and economic relationships with the cities and local communities in which they are based, and how this 'global sense of place' (Massey, 1991) can contribute to our understanding of what it now means to be a civic university. The way that institutions manage these kinds of tensions, arising from the discord of the historically shaped civic missions of universities discussed in this chapter and the pressures of the current higher education environments in which they operate, is a core theme of the subsequent chapters in this volume.

References

AASCU Task Force on Public Engagement (2002), *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place: A Guide for Leading Public Engagement at State Colleges and Universities*, Washington DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Addie, J-P., R. Keil and K. Olds (2015), 'Beyond town and gown: universities, territoriality and the mobilization of new urban structures in Canada', *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 3 (1), 27–50.

Altbach, P.G. (1999), 'The logic of mass higher education', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 5 (2), 107–124.

Annette, J. (2010), 'The challenge of developing civic engagement in higher education in England', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58 (4), 451–463.

Astin, A.W. (1998), 'The changing American college student: thirty-year trends, 1966–1996', *Review of Higher Education*, 21 (2), 115–135.

Barnes, S.V. (1996), 'England's civic universities and the triumph of the Oxbridge ideal', *History of Education Quarterly*, 36 (3), 271–305.

Barnett, Ronald (2007), 'Recovering the civic university', in Lorraine McIlrath and Iain Mac Labhrainn (eds), *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: International Perspectives*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, pp. 25–35.

Bawa, Ahmed C. and Ronaldo Munck (2012), 'Forward: globalizing civic engagement', in Lorraine McIlrath, Ann Lyons and Ronaldo Munck (eds), *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: Comparative Perspectives*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. xi–xix.

Bender, Thomas. (1988), 'Introduction', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–10.

Benson, L. and I. Harkavy (2000), 'Higher education's third revolution: the emergence of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university', *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5 (1), 47–57.

Biesta, G., M. Kwieck, G. Lock, H. Martins, J. Masschelein, V. Papatsiba, M. Simons, P. Zgaga (2009), 'What is the public role of the university? A proposal for a public research agenda', *European Educational Research Journal*, 8 (2), 249–254.

Biesta, G. and M. Simons (2009), 'Higher education and European citizenship as a matter of public concern', *European Educational Research Journal*, 8 (2), 142–145.

Bond, R. and L. Paterson (2005), 'Coming down from the ivory tower? Academics' civic and economic engagement with the community', *Oxford Review of Education*, 31 (3), 331–351.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1990), *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1996), 'The scholarship of engagement', *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49 (7), 18–33.

Bingle, R.G. and J.A. Hatcher (1996), 'Implementing service learning in higher education', *Journal of Higher Education*, 67 (2), 221–239.

Brockliss, L. (2000), 'Gown and town: the university and the city in Europe, 1200–2000', *Minerva*, 38 (2), 147–170.

Bromley, R. (2006), 'On and off campus: colleges and universities as local stakeholders', *Planning, Practice and Research*, 21 (1), 1–24.

Bush, Vannevar (1945), *Science – The Endless Frontier: A Report to the President on a Program for Postwar Scientific Research*, Washington DC: National Science Foundation.

Calhoun, C. (2006), 'The university and the public good', *Thesis Eleven*, 84 (1), 7–43.

Chatterton, P. and J. Goddard (2000), 'The response of higher education institutions to regional needs', *European Journal of Education*, 35 (4), 475–496.

Checkoway, B. (2001), 'Renewing the civic mission of the American research university', *Journal of Higher Education*, 72 (2), 125–147.

Cohen, Arthur M. (1998), *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Delanty, Gerard (2001), *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*, Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Delanty, Gerard (2002), 'The university and modernity: a history of the present', in Kevin Robins and Frank Webster (eds), *The Virtual University: Knowledge, Markets, and Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 31–48.

Frijhoff, Willem (1996), 'Patterns', in Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe: Volume II Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 43–110.

Gibb, Allan A. and Gay Haskins (2014), 'The university of the future: an entrepreneurial stakeholder learning organisation?', in Alain Foyle and Dana T Redford (eds), *Handbook on the Entrepreneurial University*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 25–63.

Giroux, H.A. (2002), 'Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: the university as a democratic public sphere', *Harvard Educational Review*, 72 (4), 425–464.

Goddard, John (2009), *Reinventing the Civic University*, London: NESTA.

Goddard, John and Paul Vallance (2013), *The University and the City*, Abingdon, UK and New York, USA: Routledge.

Gumprecht, B. (2003), 'The American college town', *Geographical Review*, 93 (1), 51–80.

Harkavy, I. and J.L. Puckett (1994), 'Lessons from Hull House for the contemporary urban university', *Social Service Review*, 68 (3), 299–321.

Hartley, M. (2009), 'Reclaiming the democratic purposes of American higher education: tracing the trajectory of the civic engagement movement', *Learning and Teaching*, 2 (3), 11–30.

Hartley, M., J. Saltmarsh and P. Clayton (2010), 'Is the civic engagement movement changing higher education?', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58 (4), 391–406.

Hazelkorn, E. (2012), "“Everyone wants to be like Harvard” – or do they? Cherishing all Missions Equally', in Adrian Curaj, Peter Scott, Lazăr Vlăsceanu and Lesley Wilson (eds), *European Higher Education at the Crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 837–862.

Heyck, T.W. (1987), 'The idea of a university in Britain, 1870–1970', *History of European Ideas*, 8 (2), 205–219.

Hollister, R.M., J.P. Pollock, M. Gearan, J. Reid, S. Stroud and E. Babcock (2012), 'The Talloires Network: a global coalition of engaged universities', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16 (4), 81–102.

Hurtado, S. (2007), 'Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education', *Review of Higher Education*, 30 (2), 185–196.

Johnson, E.L. (1981), 'Misconceptions about the early land-grant colleges', *Journal of Higher Education*, 52 (4), 333–351.

Jöns, H. and M. Hoyler (2013), 'Global geographies of higher education: the perspective of world university rankings', *Geoforum*, 46 (1), 45–59.

Kellogg Commission (2001), *Returning to our Roots: Executive Summaries of the Reports of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities*, Washington DC: NASULGC.

Key, S. (1996), 'Economics or education: the establishment of American land-grant universities', *Journal of Higher Education*, 67 (2), 196–220.

Locke, Robert R. (1984), *The End of the Practical Man: Entrepreneurship and Higher Education in Germany, France, and Great Britain, 1880–1940*, Greenwich, CT, USA and London, UK: Jai Press.

Lynch, K. (2006), 'Neo-liberalism and marketisation: the implications for higher education', *European Educational Research Journal*, 5 (1), 1–17.

Mack, E.A. and K. Stolarick (2014), 'The gift that keeps on giving: land-grant universities and regional prosperity', *Environment and Planning A*, 32 (3), 384–404.

Martin, B.R. (2012), 'Are universities and university research under threat? Towards an evolutionary model of university speciation', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36 (3), 543–565.

Massey, D. (1991), 'A global sense of place', *Marxism Today*, June, 24–29.

McDowell, G.R. (2003), 'Engaged universities: lessons from the land-grant universities and extension', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 585 (1), 31–50.

Menand, Louis (2001), *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America*, London: Flamingo.

Neary, Mike (2014), 'The university and the city: Social Science Centre, Lincoln – forming the urban revolution', in Paul Temple (ed.), *The Physical University: Contours of Space and Place in Higher Education*, Abingdon, UK and New York, USA: Routledge, pp. 203–216.

O'Mara, M.P. (2012), 'Beyond town and gown: university economic engagement and the legacy of the urban crisis', *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37 (2), 234–250.

Ostrander, S.A. (2004), 'Democracy, civic participation, and the university: a comparative study of civic engagement on five campuses', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33 (1), 74–93.

Perry, David C. and Wim Wiewel (eds) (2005), *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*, Armonk, NY, USA and London, UK: M.E. Sharpe.

Riddle, P. (1993), 'Political authority and university formation in Europe, 1200–1800', *Sociological Perspectives*, 36 (1), 45–62.

Robins, Kevin and Frank Webster (2002), 'The virtual university?', in Kevin Robins and Frank Webster (eds), *The Virtual University: Knowledge, Markets, and Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–19.

Rodin, J. (2005), 'The 21st century urban university: new roles for practice and research', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71 (3), 237–249.

Rosenberg, N. and R.R. Nelson (1994), 'American universities and technical advance in industry', *Research Policy*, 23 (3), 323–348.

Rothblatt, Sheldon (1988), 'London: a metropolitan university?', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 119–149.

Saarivirta, T. (2010), 'Finnish higher education expansion and regional policy', *Higher Education Quarterly*, 64 (4), 353–372.

Sanderson, Michael (1972), *The Universities and British Industry 1850–1970*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sanderson, M. (1988), 'The English civic universities and the 'Industrial Spirit', 1870–1914', *Historical Research*, 61 (144), 90–104.

- Sax, Linda J. (2000), 'Citizenship development and the American college student', in Thomas Ehrlich (ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, Westport, CT: Oryx Press, pp. 3–18.
- Schofer, E. and J.W. Meyer (2005), 'The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century', *American Sociological Review*, 70 (6), 898–920.
- Schwarz, L. (2004), 'Professions, elites, and universities in England, 1870–1970', *Historical Journal*, 47 (4), 941–962.
- Scott, J.C. (2006), 'The mission of the university: medieval to postmodern transformations', *Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (1), 1–39.
- Scott, P. (2014), 'The reform of English higher education: universities in global, national and regional contexts', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 7 (2), 217–231.
- Shils, Edward (1988), 'The university, the city, and the world: Chicago and the University of Chicago', in Thomas Bender (ed.), *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 210–230.
- Slaughter, Shelia and Larry L. Leslie (1997), *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stokes, Donald E. (1997), *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Scientific and Technological Innovation*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Taylor, P.J., M. Hoyler and D.M. Evans (2008), 'A geohistorical study of "the rise of modern science": mapping scientific practice through urban networks, 1500–1900', *Minerva*, 46 (4), 391–410.
- Teichler, Ulrich (1988), *Changing Patterns of the Higher Education System: The Experience of Three Decades*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Trow, Martin (2006), 'Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII', in James J.F. Forest and Philip G. Altbach (eds), *International Handbook of Higher Education*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 243–280.
- Vernon, K. (2001), 'Calling the tune: British universities and the state, 1880–1914', *History of Education*, 30 (3), 251–271.
- Vernon, Keith (2009), 'Civic universities and community engagement in inter-war England', in Peter Cunningham, Susan Oosthuizen and Richard Taylor (eds), *Beyond the Lecture Hall: Universities and Community Engagement from the Middle Ages to the Present Day*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge, pp. 31–48.
- Walsh, J.J. (2009), 'The university movement in the North of England at the end of the nineteenth century', *Northern History*, 46 (1), 113–131.
- Ward, Elaine and Ellen Hazelkorn (2012), 'Engaging with the community', in Sjur Bergan, Eva Egron-Polak, Jürgen Kohler, Lewis Purser and Martina Vukasović (eds), *Handbook on Leadership and Governance in Higher Education*, Stuttgart: Raabe Verlag.

Watson, David (2007), *Managing Civic and Community Engagement*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Watson, David. Robert M. Hollister, Susan Stroud and Elizabeth Babcock (2011), *The Engaged University: International Perspectives on Civic Engagement*, New York, USA and Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Wiewel, Wim and David C. Perry (eds) (2008), *Global Universities and Urban Development: Case Studies and Analysis*, Armonk, NY, USA and London, UK: M.E. Sharpe.

Zlotkowski, Edward (2007), 'The case for service learning', in Lorraine McIlrath and Iain Mac Labhrainn (eds), *Higher Education and Civic Engagement: International Perspectives*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, pp. 37–52.

References to other chapters in the volume

Addie, J-P D. and Paskins, J. (2016) University College London: leveraging the civic capacity of 'London's Global University', pp.257-277 (Chapter 13).

Bernard, J. and Bates, C. (2016) Dublin Institute of Technology: moving, merging, and managing the civic engagement mission, pp.180-200 (Chapter 9).

Cameron-Coen, S. and Allwright, S. (2016) From colonisation to collaboration: challenges of repositioning Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin, within its community, pp.160-179 (Chapter 8).

Sotarauta, M. (2016) Leading a fundamentally detuned choir: University of Tampere, Finland – a civic university?, pp.117-134 (Chapter 6).